DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 013 HE 019 326

AUTHOR Sorcinelli, Mary Deane; Near, Janet P.
TITLE Relationships between Work and Life away from Work among University Faculty: Gender and Rank Effects.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Rank (Professional); Age Groups; *College Faculty; *Family Life; Females; Higher Education; Individual Needs; *Job Satisfaction; *Leisure Time; *Life Satisfaction; Males; Occupational Aspiration; Stress Variables; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Welfare; Well Being

ABSTRACT

Spillover between work and life away from work was studied with 100 college faculty, who lived in a small college town, where work and life outside of work appear closely bound. The effects of gender and academic rank on the incidence of spillover between work and nonwork were assessed. Faculty from humanities and natural sciences departments and two professional schools were studied. Interviews and questionnaires were completed by assistant professors, associate professors, full professors under age 50, and full professors age 50 and over. Seventy-two percent of the sample were male, and 28% were female. Information was obtained on career choice, opportunities and constraints, transitions and aspirations, the effect of life away from work on academic careers, interests, incentives, and work and nonwork satisfactions. Both family-work linkages and leisure-work linkages were examined. Spillover was found for this population, although no significant sex differences were found. While half of the sample reported positive spillover between work and family or personal life, half also described stresses in balancing time and commitment to family with career aspirations. No significant differences in spillover of the work-family linkage was found by rank; however, significant differences were associated with rank in spillover of work and leisure. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED270013

Relationships Between Work and Life Away From Work Among University Faculty: Gender and Rank Effects

by

Mary Deane Sorcinelli
Dean of the Faculties Office
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405
(812) 335-0248

and

Janet P. Near
School of Business
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405
(812) 335-8529

A Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April, 1986.

This study was sponsored by the Dean of Faculties Office, Indiana University, Bloomington.

HE 019 326

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mary Deane Sorcinelli

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

To what extent is work reflected in the broader arena of life? How individuals relate work to life away from work--or indeed whether they do--is a question not yet answered, despite extensive study and debate. Reviews of research on the relation between work and life away from work (Champoux, 1981; Kabanoff & O'Brien, 1980; Rice & Hunt, 1980; Staines, 1980) have interpreted results of studies in terms of three hypothesized mechanisms for relating work to nonwork: spillover, compensation, and segmentation.

Formulation of these hypotheses is generally credited to Wilensky (1960) but other researchers have discussed similar ideas. The spillover hypothesis proposes that experiences and/or feelings associated with work directly color or "spill over" to life outside of work and vice versa. The compensation hypothesis suggests an inverse relationship between work and life away from work. From this view, the individual compensates for disappointments in one domain (e.g., work that receives little recognition) by seeking rewards in the other (e.g., a satisfying family life). Finally, the segmentation hypothesis proposes that the domains of work and life away from work are separate. Seeman (1967) suggests that individuals actively attempt to keep the domains of their lives strictly segmented, while Dubin (1956,1973) proposes that the structure of society separates various institutions that touch peoples' lives, such as work, family, and community.

Unfortunately, survey research using the usual methods of representative (i.e., random) sampling of the general population has failed to provide a clear answer to the question of what mechanism best explains the relation between work and life outside of work. Although it is often assumed that work affects leisure time, family relations, and basic self-worth, some of the

To what extent is work reflected in the broader arena of life? How individuals relate work to life away from work--or indeed whether they do--is a question not yet answered, despite extensive study and debate. Reviews of research on the relation between work and life away from work (Champoux, 1981; Kabanoff & O'Brien, 1980; Rice & Hunt, 1980; Staines, 1980) have interpreted results of studies in terms of three hypothesized mechanisms for relating work to nonwork: spillover, compensation, and segmentation.

Formulation of these hypotheses is generally credited to Wilensky (1960) but other researchers have discussed similar ideas. The spillover hypothesis proposes that experiences and/or feelings associated with work directly color or "spill over" to life outside of work and vice versa. The compensation hypothesis suggests an inverse relationship between work and life away from work. From this view, the individual compensates for disappointments in one domain (e.g., work that receives little recognition) by seeking rewards in the other (e.g., a satisfying family life). Finally, the segmentation hypothesis proposes that the domains of work and life away from work are separate. Seeman (1967) suggests that individuals actively attempt to keep the domains of their lives strictly segmented, while Dubin (1956,1973) proposes that the structure of society separates various institutions that touch peoples' lives, such as work, family, and community.

Unfortunately, survey research using the usual methods of representative (i.e., random) sampling of the general population has failed to provide a clear answer to the question of what mechanism best explains the relation between work and life outside of work. Although it is often assumed that work affects leisure time, family relations, and basic self-worth, some of the

in a small isolated Canadian town (Meissner, 1971). Such research has not focused on academics or other professionals. Still, studies on faculty work, family life and leisure activities suggest that academic work and life away from work are coterminous. Faculty members are likely to spend large amounts of time working at home. They tie vacations to their work (scheduling vacations to coincide with leaves, conferences), voraciously read within and outside their discipline, and tend to socialize with other academics (Finkelstein, 1984). Work, family, and community life all contribute to or constrain career development (Sorcinelli, 1985). Put simply, academic work appears to shape and be shaped by the nature of family life and leisure activity.

If spillover is <u>not</u> found in such a unique sample, then we might wonder whether it exists at all. If spillover does appear, then we may be able to determine conditions under which it is likely to arise.

Hypotheses

The present study examines the lives of university faculty in a small college town; as noted , if spillover were not found in such a sample, where work and life outside of work appear inextricably bound, then one might question its occurrence in the general population. Thus, the first hypothesis:

H_1 Spillover will be greater for a sample whose work lives and lives away from work are more closely entwined than in the general population.

Beyond this, research has suggested that spillover may be somewhat lower among women. A review of literature on the relation between work and life satisfaction indicates that the only moderator variable consistently found to affect the relationship is gender (Rice et al., 1980). Studies conclude that

research on workers has not supported this view. In fact, one method for examining the spillover mechanism, based on the correlation between job satisfaction and life satisfaction, has consistently indicated that ten percent or less of the variance in life satisfaction is explained by job satisfaction (Rice, Near & Hunt, 1980). That is, job satisfaction seems not to be an important source of life satisfaction. Although a more recent review has indicated a slightly higher univariate association (Baldwin, Tate & Youtz, 1985), the multivariate relationship between the two variables is even weaker when the effects of other variables are controlled (Rice et al., 1980). The implications of this finding are enormous. If, in fact, work and life away from work are not strongly related for the general population, then efforts to improve the quality of work life may be of limited value, since they will have little effect on the overall quality of life. Likewise, if life away from work has little influence on work, then this would call for a rethinking of the design of jobs and organizations, and expectations associated with them.

One possible explanation of these results is that earlier research has focused primarily on a broad cross-section of the population. By aggregating scores from dissimilar subgroups this research may have failed to identify cases of spillover. If spillover can be found in some subsamples, then the variables that influence its development might be specified.

It appears that the problem requires different research strategies. The present study explores the possible ways in which work and life away from work are related in a subsample of the general population--university faculty members--in which spillover would be most likely. One previous study examined the spillover hypothesis by focusing on a unique sample: blue collar workers

work satisfaction is more strongly related to life satisfaction for men. It is generally assumed that the reason for the difference is that work is less important for women; therefore, the correlation between work and life satisfaction would be expected to be lower for women (Rice, McFarlin, Hunt, & Near, in press), suggesting less spillover. Studies of job satisfaction of women academics show a related pattern. Women scholars are significantly less satisfied with their jobs than male academics (Finkelstein, 1984).

Unfortunately, gender may be confounded with other variables. The effects of job level were not controlled in most gender studies; a study of men and women holding comparable professional status or rank might be expected to produce different results. Results from more recent studies are less likely to show a gender effect than earlier research, suggesting that satisfaction with work has become as important to women as it traditionally has been for men (Baldwin et al., 1985). The finding of gender effect may also have been an artifact of the methodology used. With discriminant analysis of different spillover and compensation patterns, Kabanoff & O'Brien (1980) found that supplementary compensation (a pattern of low job enrichment combined with high leisure enrichment) was more likely among women than men; furthermore, active spillover (highly enriched job and leisure activities) was also more common among women. In light of conflicting results, we predict that:

H_2 Gender will be unrelated to the incidence of spillover between work and aspects of life away from work.

Finally, one might argue that the additional pressures and stresses experienced by junior faculty compared to senior colleagues might produce greater--albeit negative--spillover within this group. Sarason (1977) has suggested that commitment to a single professional career for the course of

one's life can create a sense that life without that career would be unimaginable. To young faculty, who have invested time, effort and ego in developing skills not easily transferable to other careers, the threat of failure (e.g., failure to obtain tenure) may seem severe. Conflicts between career aspirations and family or personal considerations (dual careers, small children, civic interests) seem likely. Coupled with an economy that makes the chances for success less than at any time in recent decades, the stress especially on junior faculty--and the corresponding negative spillover--must be important. As a result, we predict that rank will be inversely related to spillover; as faculty become more senior it is expected that they will feel both the freedom and pressure to engage in compensation or segregation. Therefore:

H_3 Rank will be inversely related to the incidence of spillover between work and aspects of life away from work.

Methods

Sample

To address the issues posed above, we obtained data from a sample of 112 faculty. Four academic units were selected to provide a variety of academic career experiences. Faculty were randomly sampled from within one department in the humanities, one in the natural sciences, and two professional schools. The sample was stratified by academic rank and sex, with approximately six women and six men from each of four categories per department: assistant professors, associate professors, full professors under age 50 and full professors age 50 and over. In two departments, the entire population qualified for participation; in the other two, a random stratified sample was

selected. In some instances, an insufficient number of cases was available in the population (e.g., female full professors). Twenty-one percent of the sample were assistant professors, 30% were associate professors, and 49% were full professors, percentages that approximate the full-time faculty population at the university studied. The ranks of lecturer, instructor, and administrator were removed from consideration. Seventy-two percent of the sample was male and 28% female. Because of limited information on women faculty (Mathis, 1979) the sample was purposely larger than the 16% female faculty population.

Data Collection

The study employed two types of data: in-depth interviews followed by questionnaires. The interview guide consisted of ten open-ended questions that supplied a frame of reference for respondents, but put a minimum of restraint on their answers; average time required for each interview was two hours. The interviews provided information on career choice, strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and constraints, transitions and aspirations, and the effect of life away from work on an academic career. The questionnaires were completed after the interview and provided more information on interests, preferences, and incentives, as well as work and nonwork satisfactions. While the strength of the interview was the opportunity it provided faculty members for qualitative, in-depth discussion and formulation of individual perspectives, the questionnaire data permitted quantitative comparisons.

The interview schedule and questionnaire were pretested, revised and piloted during December, 1983 - January, 1984. Interviews began in February, 1984 and were completed in September, 1984. One hundred of the 112 questionnaires were returned, for a response rate of 89%.

Measures

Life satisfaction. Following Campbell, Rodgers and Converse (1976) life satisfaction was measured on the standardized average of two scores: (1) the standard mean score on questionnaire responses to a ten-item semantic differential scale and (2) a general question on overall life satisfaction rated on a five-point scale (Cronbach's alpha = .83).

Job satisfaction. The measure of job satisfaction used in these analyses was based on the idea of facet-specific job satisfaction, or satisfactions tied to particular aspects of the job (Quinn & Shepard, 1974). A scale of job satisfaction was created based on questionnaire ratings of the following: recognition within university, discipline and society; opportunity to pursue scholarly and teaching interests; interaction with colleagues and students; personal autonomy; opportunity to impact others; enough time to do work; and financial rewards, including salary and fringe benefits. Each of these 12 items was rated on a five-point scale and scores were summed (Cronbach's alpha = .77).

Nonwork satisfaction. Drawing on the work of Near, Smith, Rice and Hunt (1983, 1984) a scale of nonwork satisfaction was created by summing satisfaction scores on the following: community, health, neighborhood, friends, standard of living, career opportunities for spouse, leisure time, nonwork organizations, social interaction, house/apartment, housework/yardwork, parents/siblings, children, marriage/current relationships, family life and childcare options. These questionnaire items were rated on five-point scales (Cronbach's alpha = .81).

Spillover, compensation and segmentation. The two interviewers coded the way in which individuals related work and life away from work based on responses to the question: "How has life outside of work made an impact on your career (and vice versa)?" Overall coder reliability was checked across the sample on three interview questions. The average rate of agreement was 93% for the three questions, which were randomly selected and seemed representative of other questions on the schedule.

Previous research on spillover, compensation and segmentation has used varying strategies. Kabanoff and O'Brien (1980) asked respondents to describe job and leisure activities, which were then coded in terms of task attributes; this method avoids possible percept/percept correlation between respondents' ratings of their work and leisure activities and their feelings about these activities. A second method focuses on feelings rather than activities and involves interpreting the correlation between job and life satisfaction to reflect spillover (i.e., a positive correlation), compensation (i.e., a negative correlation), and segmentation (i.e., a correlation of zero), an assumption that does not permit examination of the patterns of relationship (Near, Rice & Hunt, 1978; Near et al., 1983, 1984; Rice, Near & Hunt, 1979).

In the present study we employed measures that allow us to approximate both methods and consider their similarities and differences. That is, we have both respondents' ratings of their feelings toward work and life away from work and the interviewers' ratings of individuals' reported work and beyond work activities. In the latter case, it should be noted that activities and feelings overlapped for most respondents. For example, some experienced the "lack of sufficient time to do my work" both as an aspect of

their job and a source of stress. Both the activity and feeling about work could spill over, ripplelike, to life outside of work as respondents "stole time" from family or leisure activities and experienced more stress as a consequence.

Two assessments were made for each respondent. In the first, the interviewers classified individuals as to whether they primarily used spillover, compensation or segmentation in relating work to family life. In the second instance, the interviewers categorized respondents as to whether they used spillover, compensation or segmentation in relating work to leisure life. Thus, individuals could be classified differently on the two measures, e.g., as spillover with regard to family-work linkage and compensation with regard to leisure-work linkage.

For both measures the interviewers also indicated directionality (positive, negative, ambivalent). Positive spillover suggested that feelings (e.g., stimulation) or activities (e.g., reading) that spill over between work and family or leisure were considered positive. Negative spillover was coded when the feelings (e.g., disillusionment) or activities (e.g., time conflicts) that generalized between work and family or leisure were negative. Individuals who discussed both of positive and negative spillover were coded as ambivalent.

Compensation was considered negative by definition. Segmentation was coded as either positive--i.e., the respondent chose to segregate activities/feelings--vs. negative, when the respondent felt forced by outside pressures to segregate work and family or leisure life.

Data Analysis

In testing the hypotheses we examined zero-order correlations among the variables. We compared male and female respondents' responses and responses by rank using Chi squared.

Results

Findings supported the first two hypotheses but only partially supported the third hypothesis. The Pearson correlation between job satisfaction and life satisfaction was .64 ($p < .001$); the correlation between job satisfaction and nonwork satisfaction was .45 ($p < .001$). Both are substantially higher than the average correlation of .31 found in over 200 examinations of the relationship (Rice et al., 1980). A recent study (Baldwin et al., 1985) concluded that the national average correlation between job and life satisfaction, corrected for attenuation, was actually .44. Quinn and Shepard (1974), using a random stratified national sample, found a correlation between life satisfaction and facet specific job satisfaction of .46. Thus the apparent spillover between work and life satisfaction is higher in this unique sample than generally would be expected, probably reflecting the fact that, for academics, work and the rest of life are interrelated.

To test the second hypothesis, measures of spillover, compensation and segmentation were examined directly. Recall that respondents were classified on these measures for each of two categories: family-work linkage and leisure-work linkage. Contingency table analysis revealed no significant differences between male and female respondents on either of these two measures, as seen in Tables 1 and 2. It is notable that the vast majority of both men and women were classified in the spillover category for family-work linkage and leisure-work linkage.

Insert Tables 1 & 2 About Here

Because most respondents were in the spillover category, a closer examination of responses for that group seemed warranted. Results revealed no significant differences associated with gender in the kind of spillover (positive, negative, ambivalent) reported for the family-work linkage, as seen in Table 3. While 50% of men and women faculty members reported positive spillover between work and family or personal life, half also described stresses in balancing time and commitment to family with career aspirations. There were, however, significant differences associated with gender in the kind of spillover reported for the leisure-work linkage (See Table 4). Women faculty were more likely to report negative spillover. Common worries were lack of social opportunities in a small community or need to curtail social and leisure activities (hobbies, exercise, civic activities) in order to advance the career.

Insert Tables 3 & 4 About Here

In the third hypothesis we predicted differences in spillover associated with rank. In fact, contingency analysis indicated no significant differences in spillover of the work-family linkage (Table 5) by rank. There were, however, significant differences associated with rank in spillover of work and leisure (Table 6). Thus the support for this hypothesis was somewhat mixed.

Insert Tables 5 and 6 About Here

In comparing results for these two analyses, the major difference appears to be that fewer assistant professors report work-leisure segmentation than work-family segmentation. Spillover is the mechanism reported in greatest incidence by all three ranks, although the percentage of assistant professors in this group is higher than among other ranks for the work-leisure linkage. The only compensators appear among faculty at the associate rank, although this is a very small group.

Again, since most respondents were in the spillover category, we examined responses for that group. There were significant differences associated with rank in the kind of spillover reported for both the family-work and leisure-work linkages (see Tables 7 and 8). Assistant professors reported more negative spillover between work and family life than did associate and full professors. Junior faculty cited conflicts between time and energy for work and for spouses, children, dual careers, and commuter marriages. Assistant professors also expressed more negative spillover between work and leisure activities than faculty at other ranks. Lack of time and energy for reading, hobbies, social and civic activities were common concerns.

Insert Tables 7 and 8 About Here

Discussion

Evidence of spillover between work and life away from work has been debated on theoretical grounds (Dubin, 1976; Kabanoff, 1980; Near et al., 1980, Staines, 1980) and on the basis of empirical results (Champoux, 1981; Near et al., 1978, 1983, 1984; Rice et al., 1979, 1985). Perhaps the

strongest case for spillover was made by Meissner (1971) based on his study of workers in a small, isolated Canadian town, supported by studies that also suggested the possibility of individual differences (Evans & Bartolome, 1980; Kabanoff & O'Brien, 1980). Conflicting results were produced by Rice et al. (in press), however, who found no substantial evidence of moderator variables that might account for individual differences. The present study focused on a sample for which the spillover response was considered most likely, namely university faculty members in a small university town. The results in fact supported the expectation that the incidence of spillover would be substantially higher than in the general population.

The implications of this finding are important for institutions of higher education. Despite individual differences, the high correlation between work and life satisfaction and apparent incidence of spillover between work and life away from work among faculty is of a magnitude that should not be ignored. The fact that academic work influences and is influenced by life outside of work should not be surprising, but it challenges the ways in which academic organizations function. Institutional structures and policies operate as though concerns about personal, family, and community life are separate from work life. These results show that the separation clearly is not being maintained and suggest the need to broaden the landscape and to consider an encompassing view of the careers of faculty. Our data do not show that faculty are dissatisfied but many appear to suffer stress as a result of negative spillover between their work and lives away from work. Negative spillover of this sort has also been found to exist for business executives (Bartolome & Evans, 1980). In both groups it seems likely to reduce

performance at work and individual health, although this possibility has not been examined empirically.

There are signs that institutions are beginning to realize that work and life beyond work are not isolated entities. Some faculty development centers attempt to integrate personal and professional growth through programs on such topics as financial, stress, and time management, intimacy, and the academic environment and family life (Baldwin et al., 1981). But while a seminar might assist a few individuals, more renewal would come from developing or rethinking institutional policies. Faculty members are interested in supportive and flexible policies on dual careers, commuter marriages, child care services, leaves and sabbaticals (especially for pregnancy, for faculty with working spouses or families), and retirement planning and options (Sorcinelli, 1985).

Beyond this, the results suggest that in this sample an important moderator variable, gender, has no significant effect on the use of spillover. In other words, mechanisms selected for relating work and life away from work do not appear to differ between men and women faculty members. One explanation might be that such individuals hold similar values based on both the socialization process of graduate school and their relatively equal occupational status. But, studies indicate that gaps remain in pay, promotion, opportunities for grants and administrative posts between men and women in academia (Finkelstein, 1984).

Perhaps this finding tells more about the relative importance of work in women faculty members' lives. It may help to dispel notions that women are less involved with work and that it is less a central aspect of their

identity. If anything, these academic women were more likely to have foregone personal commitments and reduced leisure activities in order to advance their careers. It may also help to dispel the stereotype that for men, investment in work excludes commitment to personal, marriage, or family life. More male faculty members were married and had children and they expressed considerable concern about dual careers, commuter marriages, and childrearing. Among these academic men, work clearly influenced life away from work and in turn, personal issues affected the workplace.

Finally, as for differences in spillover associated with rank, most faculty members reported spillover as the mechanism for relating work to family and leisure life. The only faculty members who used compensation (making up for disappointments at work with satisfactions outside of work) were at associate rank, although this was a very small group.

Among assistant professors, however, spillover was higher (and more negative) in the case of the work-leisure linkage. And while not reporting significantly higher spillover between work and family life, assistant professors reported more negative spillover. Certainly, colleges and universities do not want to encourage an environment in which young faculty must ignore family and civic obligations in order to advance. It would seem that successful relations between work, family, and leisure are of benefit to the individual, family, university, and society. If so, institutions of higher education need to assume a role in helping junior faculty to balance their personal and professional lives.

References

Baldwin, T.A., Tate, M. & Youtz, M.A. (1985). Job and life satisfaction: A meta-analytic examination of the strength of the relationship and gender effect. Unpublished working paper, East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Campbell, A., Converse, P.E., & Rogers, W.L. (1976). The quality of American life: Perceptions, evaluations, and satisfaction. Sage Foundation: New York.

Champoux, J. (1981). An exploratory study of the role of job scope, need for achievement and social status in the relationship between work and nonwork. Sociology and Social Research, 65: 153-176.

Dubin, R. (1956). Industrial workers' worlds: The central life interests of industrial workers. Journal of Social Issues, 3: 131-142.

Dubin, R. (1973). Work and nonwork: Institutional perspectives. In M.D. Dunette (Ed.), Work and nonwork in the year 2001. Brooks/Cole, Monterey.

Evans, P.A.L. & Bartolome (1980). The relationship between professional life and private life. In C.B. Derr (Ed.), Work, Family and Career. Praeger: New York.

Finkelstein, M.J. (1984). The academic profession. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Gerstl, J. (1971). Leisure, taste and occupational milieu. In C. Anderson & J. Murray (Eds.), Cambridge, MA: Schenckman.

Kabanoff, B. & O'Brien, G.E. (1980). Work and leisure: A task attributes analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology 65: 596-609.

Kabanoff, B. (1980). Work and nonwork: A review of models, methods and findings. Psychological Bulletin, 88: 60-77.

Meissner, M. (1971). The long arm of the job. In W.E. Mann (Ed.), Canada: A sociological profile. Toronto: Copp-Clark.

Near, J.P., Rice, R.W., & Hunt, R.G. (1978). Work and extra-work correlates of life and job satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 21: 248-264.

Near, J.P., Rice, R.W., & Hunt, R.G. (1980). The relationship between work and nonwork domains: A review of empirical research, Academy of Management Review, 5: 415-429.

Near, J.P., Smith, C.A., Rice, R.W., & Hunt, R.G. (1983). Job satisfaction and nonwork satisfaction as components of life satisfaction. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 13: 126-144.

Near, J.P., Smith, C.A., Rice, R.W., & Hunt, R.G. (1984). A comparison of work and nonwork predictors of life satisfaction, Academy of Management Journal, 27: 184-190.

Payton-Miyazaki, M. & Brayfield, A.H. (1976). The good job and the good life: Relationship characteristics of employment to general well-being. In A.D. Biderman and T.F. Drury (Eds.), Measuring work quality for social reporting. Wiley: New York.

Quinn, R.P. & Shepard, L.J. (1974). The 1972-73 quality of employment study. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Rice, R.W., McFarlin, D.B., Hunt, R.G., & Near, J.P. (1985). Organizational work and the perceived quality of life: Toward a conceptual model, Academy of Management Review, 26: 177-188.

Rice, R.W., McFarlin, D.B., Hunt, R.G., & Near, J.P. (in press). Moderators of the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction. Basic and Applied Social Psychology.

Rice, R.W., Near, J.P., Hunt, R.G. (1979). Unique variance in job and life satisfaction associated with work-related and extra-workplace variables. Human Relations, 32: 605-623.

Rice, R.W., Near, J.P. & Hunt, R.G. (1980). The job satisfaction-life satisfaction relationship: A review of empirical research. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 1: 37-64.

Sarason, S.B. (1977). Work, aging and social change: Professionals and the one life-one career imperative. New York: Free Press.

Seeman, M. (1967). On the personal consequences of alienation in work. American Sociological Review, 23: 273-285.

Sorcinelli, M.D. (1985). Faculty careers: Personal, institutional and societal dimensions. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois (Eric document No. ED 182 465).

Sorcinelli, M.D. (1985). Faculty careers: Satisfaction and discontents. In G.R. Erickson & J.R. Jeffreys (Eds.), To improve the academy. Stillwater: New Forums Press.

Staines, G.L. (1980). Spillover versus compensation: A review of the literature on the relationship between work and nonwork. Human Relations, 33: 111-129.

Wilensky, H.L. (1960). Work, careers, and social integration. International Social Science Journal, 12: 543-560.

Table 1

Contingency Table Analysis of

Work-Family Linkage by Gender[a]

	Gender		
	Male	Female	Total
Work-Family Linkage			
Spillover	60% (88%)	28% (90%)	88%
Compensation	3% (5%)	0	3%
Segmentation	5% (8%)	3% (10%)	8%

Chi-squared = 1.53, ns
N= 95

[a]The figure on the top line represents the percentage of respondents in relation to the total number; the figure in parentheses represents the percentage of respondents in relation to the number in that group (e.g., females).

Table 2

Contingency Table Analysis of

Work-Leisure Relationship by Gender[a]

	Gender		
	Male	Female	Total
Work-Leisure Linkage			
Spillover	59% (86%)	29% (93%)	88%
Compensation	4% (6%)	0	4%
Segmentation	5% (8%)	2% (7%)	6%

Chi-squared = 1.95, ns
N = 96

[a]The figure on the top line represents the percentage of respondents in relation to the total number; the figure in parentheses represents the percentage of respondents in relation to the number in that group (e.g., females).

Table 3

Contingency Analysis of Work-Family Spillover by Gender[a]

	Gender		
	Male	Female	Total
Work-Family Spillover			
Positive	35% (51%)	16% (48%)	50%
Negative	6% (9%)	2% (7%)	8%
Ambivalent	27% (40%)	14% (44%)	42%

Chi-squared = .14, ns
N = 84

[a]The figure on the top line represents the percentage of respondents in relation to the total number; the figure in parentheses represents the percentage of respondents in relation to the number in that group (e.g., females).

Table 4

Contingency Analysis of Work-Leisure Spillover by Gender[a]

	Gender		
	Male	Female	Total
Work-Leisure Spillover			
Positive	48% (72%)	17% (50%)	65%
Negative	2% (3%)	7% (21%)	9%
Ambivalent	17% (25%)	9% (29%)	26%

Chi-squared = 7.92, $p < .05$
N = 85

[a]The figure on the top line represents the percentage of respondents in relation to the total number; the figure in parentheses represents the percentage of respondents in relation to the number in that group (e.g., females).

Table 5

Contingency Table Analysis of

Work-Family Linkage by Rank[a]

	Rank			
Work-Family Linkage	Asst.	Assoc.	Full	Total
Spillover	23% (88%)	25% (86%)	40% (91%)	88%
Compensation	0	3% (11%)	0	3%
Segmentation	3% (12%)	1% (4%)	4% (10%)	8%

Chi-squared = 8.45, ns
N = 95

[a]The figure on the top line represents the percentage of respondents in relation to the total number; the figure in parentheses represents the percentage of respondents in relation to the number in that group (e.g., assistant professors).

Table 6

Contingency Table Analysis of

Work-Leisure Linkage by Rank[a]

Work-Leisure Linkage	Rank			
	Asst.	Assoc.	Full	Total
Spillover	25% (96%)	23% (79%)	41% (91%)	89%
Compensation	0	4% (14%)	0	4%
Segmentation	1% (4%)	2% (7%)	4% (9%)	7%

Chi-squared = 10.82, ns
N = 96

[a]The figure on the top line represents the percentage of respondents in relation to the total number; the figure in parentheses represents the percentage of respondents in relation to the number in that group (e.g., assistant professors).

Table 7

Contingency Table Analysis of

Work-Family Spillover by Rank[a]

	Rank			
Work-Family Spillover	Asst.	Assoc.	Full	Total
Positive	7% (27%)	16% (54%)	27% (60%)	50%
Negative	6% (23%)	1% (4%)	5% (3%)	8%
Ambivalent	13% (50%)	12% (42%)	17% (37%)	42%

Chi-squared = 11.23, $p < .05$
N = 84

[a]The figure on the top line represents the percentage of respondents in relation to the total number; the figure in parentheses represents the percentage of respondents in relation to the number in that group (e.g., assistant professors).

Table 8

Contingency Table Analysis of

Work-Leisure Spillover by Rank[a]

	Rank			
Work-Leisure Spillover	Asst.	Assoc.	Full	Total
Positive	8% (29%)	19% (73%)	38% (82%)	65%
Negative	7% (25%)	1% (4%)	1% (3%)	9%
Ambivalent	13% (46%)	6% (23%)	7% (15%)	26%

Chi-squared = 20.85, $p < .01$
N = 85

[a]The figure on the top line represents the percentage of respondents in relation to the total number; the figure in parentheses represents the percentage of respondents in relation to the number in that group (e.g., assistant professors).